REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 6-12 and 14-17 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 6-12 and 14-17 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 7, and 10 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. Claims 18-20 have been added. Support for the amendments is found in the specification, the drawings, and in the claims as originally filed. Applicants submit that the amendments do not add new matter.

Applicants reserve all rights with respect to the applicability of the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to overcome the Examiner's rejection.

Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is now allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-2, 5-8, 10, 11, and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,415,323 to McCanne et al. ("McCanne"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,314,088 to Yamano ("Yamano"), in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,822,320 to Horikawa ("Horikawa").

Applicants reserve the right to swear behind McCanne.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over McCanne, in view of Yamano, and further in view of Horikawa.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to include receiving a second request to resolve the anycast network address at the information object repository, wherein the second request to resolve is a single IP packet having the anycast network address; and returning an anycast

resolution response in response to the second request to resolve, the anycast resolution response is a single IP packet having the corresponding unicast network address.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the references cited by the Examiner discloses such limitations of amended claim 1.

McCanne discloses a proximity-based redirection system for service-node location. More specifically, McCanne discloses that the client contacts an anycast referral node via anycast service, and the referral node redirects the client to an unicast service node (col. 10, lines 35-43). In particular, McCanne discloses that the anycast referral node (ARN) responds to the clients requests with a redirection message that refers the client to the service node (col. 16, lines 17-29). McCanne fails to disclose, teach, or suggest receiving a second request to resolve the anycast network address at the information object repository, wherein the second request to resolve is a single IP packet having the anycast network address; and returning an anycast resolution response in response to the second request to resolve, the anycast resolution response is a single IP packet having the corresponding unicast network address, as recited in amended claim 1.

Yamano, in contrast, discloses a node configuration setup system with servers hunting through connection-oriented network for client's data (Abstract).

Horikawa, in contrast, discloses an address resolution for the ATM network that uses Next Hop Resolution Protocol (NHRP) (col. 1, lines 7-32).

It is respectfully submitted that neither of the references cited by the Examiner teaches or suggests a combination with each other. It would be impermissible hindsight, based on applicants' own disclosure, to incorporate the node configuration setup system of servers hunting for the clients data of Yamano and the address resolution for NHRP ATM networks of Horikawa into the redirection system for service-node location of McCanne. Furthermore, even if Yamano, Horikawa, and McCanne were combined, such a combination would still lack receiving a second request to resolve the anycast network address at the information object repository, wherein the

second request to resolve is a single IP packet having the anycast network address; and returning an anycast resolution response in response to the second request to resolve, the anycast resolution response is a single IP packet having the corresponding unicast network address, as recited in amended claim 1.

Given that claims 2, 6, 7-12, and 15-17 contain the limitations similar to the limitations discussed with respect to amended claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 6, 7-12, and 15-17 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over McCanne, in view of Yamano, and further in view of Horikawa.

Claims 9, 12 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCanne, Yamano and Horikawa, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,529,939 to Kraft ("Kraft").

Applicants reserve the right to swear behind McCanne.

It is respectfully submitted that neither of the references cited by the Examiner discloses an information object repository configured to return an anycast resolution response in response to a request to resolve the network layer anycast address, wherein the request to resolve is a single IP packet that includes the network layer anycast address, wherein the anycast resolution response is a single IP packet that includes the network layer unicast address, as recited in amended claim 7.

As set forth above, McCanne discloses a proximity-based redirection system for service-node location. Yamano, in contrast, discloses a node configuration setup system with servers hunting through connection-oriented network for client's data (Abstract).Horikawa, in contrast, discloses an address resolution for the ATM network that uses Next Hop Resolution Protocol (NHRP) (col. 1, lines 7-32).

Kraft, in contrast, discloses user-initiated maintenance of document locators (Abstract).

It is respectfully submitted that neither of the references cited by the Examiner teaches or suggests a combination with each other. It would be impermissible hindsight, based on applicants' own disclosure, to incorporate the node configuration setup system of servers hunting for the clients data of Yamano, the address resolution for NHRP ATM networks of Horikawa, and user-initiated maintenance of document locators of Kraft into the redirection system for service-node location of McCanne. Furthermore, even if Yamano, Horikawa, Kraft, and McCanne were combined, such a combination would still lack an information object repository configured to return an anycast resolution response in response to a request to resolve the network layer anycast address, wherein the request to resolve is a single IP packet that includes the network layer anycast address, wherein the anycast resolution response is a single IP packet that includes the network layer unicast address, as recited in amended claim 7.

Given that claims 9, 12 and 15 contain the limitations similar to the limitations discussed with respect to amended claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claims 9, 12 and 15 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over McCanne, in view of Yamano, in view of Horikawa, and further in view of Kraft.

Claim 17 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCanne, Yamano, Horikawa and Kraft in further view of U.S. Patent No.6,611,872 to McCanne ("McCanne 2").

Applicants reserve the right to swear behind McCanne.

Amended claim 10 includes an information object repository configured to receive the request for the information object and the request to resolve the network layer anycast address, to resolve the network layer anycast address into a network layer unicast address, to obtain a copy of the information object at the network layer unicast address, and to return an anycast resolution response in response to a request to resolve the network layer anycast address, wherein the information object repository is selected according to specified performance metrics, wherein the request to resolve is a single IP packet that includes the network layer anycast address, wherein

the anycast resolution response is a single IP packet that includes the network layer unicast address.

It is respectfully submitted that neither of the references cited by the Examiner discloses the request to resolve is a single IP packet that includes the network layer anycast address, wherein the anycast resolution response is a single IP packet that includes the network layer unicast address, as recited in amended claim 10.

As set forth above, McCanne discloses a proximity-based redirection system for service-node location. Yamano, in contrast, discloses a node configuration setup system with servers hunting through connection-oriented network for client's data (Abstract). Horikawa, in contrast, discloses an address resolution for the ATM network that uses Next Hop Resolution Protocol (NHRP) (col. 1, lines 7-32). Kraft, in contrast, discloses user-initiated maintenance of document locators (Abstract).

McCanne 2, in contrast, discloses multicast communication in computer networks (Abstract). More specifically, McCanne 2 discloses the overlay multicast network (OMN) architecture that uses two-level addressing. Further, McCanne 2 discloses that the overlay addresses are carried in an overlay header, before the UDP payload (col. 4, lines 54-60, Figure 6). In particular, McCanne 2 discloses that the content source sends the information in form of packets that include the IP header and UDP payload (col. 30, lines 29-40). Thus, McCanne 2 merely discloses that the content source sends the information in form of packets, in contrast to receiving a request to resolve the network layer anycast address that is a single IP packet that includes the network layer anycast address, and returing an anycast resolution response that is a single IP packet that includes the network layer unicast address, as recited in amended claim 10.

It is respectfully submitted that neither of the references cited by the Examiner teaches or suggests a combination with each other. It would be impermissible hindsight, based on applicants' own disclosure, to incorporate the node configuration setup system of servers hunting for the clients data of Yamano, the address resolution for NHRP ATM networks of Horikawa,

and user-initiated maintenance of document locators of Kraft, and multicasting of McCanne 2 into the redirection system for service-node location of McCanne. Furthermore, even if Yamano, Horikawa, Kraft, McCanne 2 and McCanne were combined, such a combination would still lack receiving a request to resolve the network layer anycast address that is a single IP packet that includes the network layer anycast address, and returing an anycast resolution response that is a single IP packet that includes the network layer unicast address, as recited in amended claim 10.

Given that claim 17 contains the limitations similar to the limitations discussed with respect to amended claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claim 17 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over McCanne, in view of Yamano, in view of Horikawa, in view of Kraft, and further in view of McCanne 2.

New claim 18 includes that the information object repository is selected based on a Web Information Locator by Distance (WILD) protocol.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the references cited by the Examiner discloses, teaches, or suggests such limitations of amended claim 18.

Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that new claim 18 is allowable.

Given that new claims 19 and 20 contain similar limitations, applicants respectfully submit that new claims 19 and 20 are allowable.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome. If the Examiner believes a further telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Tatiana Rossin at (408) 720-8300. If there are any additional charges, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: July 12, 2007 By: _____

Tatiana Rossin
Reg. No. 56,833

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300
Fax No. (408) 720-8383